arXiv:1702.01096v1 [math.PR] 3 Feb 2017

ON THE ERASURE ROBUSTNESS PROPERTY OF RANDOM MATRICES

RAN LU

Abstract. The study of the restricted isometry property (RIP) for corrupted random matrices is particularly important in the field of compressed sensing (CS) with corruptions. If a matrix still satisfy RIP after a certain portion of rows are erased, then we say that the matrix has the strong restricted isometry property (SRIP. In the field of compressed sensing, random matrices satisfies certain moment conditions are of particular interest. Among these matrices, those with entries generated from i.i.d Gaussian or i.i.d ± 1 random variables are often typically considered. Recent studies have shown that a matrix generated from i.i.d Gaussian random variables satisfies the strong restricted isometry property under arbitrary erasure of rows. In the first part of this paper we will work on ± 1 random matrices. We study the erasure robustness of ± 1 random matrices show that with overwhelming probability the SRIP will still hold. Moreover the analysis will also lead to the robust version of the Johnson-Lindenstrauss Lemma for ± 1 matrices. Then in the second part of this paper we work on finite frames. The study of the stability of finite frames under corruptions shares a lot of similarity to CS with corruption. We will focus on the Gaussian finite frames as a starter. We will improve existing results and confirm that a Gaussian random frame is numerically stable under arbitrary erasure of rows.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Background on Compressed Sensing.** Consider the following problem: In sensor network, we transmit a signal through independent channels and the centre hub receives observations from each channel for further analysis. In practice, it is typical that some channels fail to send the correct measurements, therefore we can only obtain the corrupted data. To deal with problems like this, methods to reconstruct a signal from sampling observations are of great interest to researchers in engineering fields. In general it is impossible to recover the signal if there is nothing known about the signal or the measurement. However, with prior knowledge to the signal, it is possible to recover the signal with negligible or even zero error. Over the past years, researchers have been refreshing their understandings on the relevancy and practicability of the assumptions, and have developed several powerful tools to study the question.

In signal processing, *compressed sensing* (CS) is a technique for signal recovery via solving certain linear systems. In compressed sensing *without corruption*, the general acquisition setting is represented as $y = Ax$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the *signal*, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the *measurement*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 62G35, 42C15.
Key words and phrases. Compressed sensing, Random matrices, Strong restricted isometry property, Finite frames.
Research supported in part by NSERC Canada under Grant RGP 228051.

and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ is the *sensing matrix* where $\mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ denotes the set of all $n \times m$ real matrices. In general it is extremely difficult to recover the signal if we know nothing about x and A. Around 2004, it was shown by Candés, Romberg and Tao in [6] and Donoho in [10] that if a signal satisfies certain sparsity conditions plus additional assumptions on the sensing matrix, then the reconstruction can be accomplished. The ideas of the proofs in these papers provided the foundations of CS.

The most important concept introduced in compressed sensing is the *restricted isometry property* (RIP), which gives a characterization of the almost norm preserving property of a matrix. This property was first set up by Candés and Tao in [7]. One can exactly recover the signal if a signal is sufficiently sparse and the sensing matrix A satisfies certain restricted isometry conditions. The main theorem was established by Candés and Tao in [7]. It was proved that if a random matrix satisfies certain moment conditions then it has the RIP with high probability (see e.g. [1],[2],[6], [13], [21], [22]). The RIP is also closely related to the well-known *Johnson-Lindenstrauss(JL) Lemma*([2, Lemma 4.1]). The JL Lemma is about embedding a discrete set of points in a high dimensional Euclidean space into a low dimensional space in a way such that the distances between points are nearly preserved. From [2, Theorem 5.2] we can see that JL Lemma implies the RIP.

1.2. **Compressed Sensing with Corruption.** A natural generalization of CS is *CS with corruptions*. In this case some elements of the measurement are corrupted. We formulate the model in this setting as follows: Given a signal $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with certain sparsity condition and a random projection matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. We only receive $A_T x$ as the observation where $T \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ is unknown and A_T denotes the sub-matrix by keeping the rows of A with indices in T. In order to reconstruct the signal accurately and efficiently in this case, it is important to verify whether A_T satisfies the RIP. This has led to the concept of the *strong restricted isometry property* (SRIP), which characterizes the norm preserving property of matrices under certain erasure of rows and plays a central role in the study of robustness of matrices. The definition of the SRIP is given in [25]:

Definition 1.1. A matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ is said to satisfy the *strong restricted isometry property* (SRIP) of order s and level $[\theta, \omega, \beta]$ with $0 < \theta \leq \omega < 2$ and $\beta \in [0, 1)$ if

$$\theta\|x\|_2^2 \leq \|A_T x\|_2^2 \leq \omega\|x\|_2^2$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\|x\|_0 \leq s$ and all $T \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $|T^c| \leq \beta n$.

In [25] the robustness and the SRIP for matrices with Gaussian entries have been settled. In [15] further results about the robustness properties of Gaussian random matrices are proved, and they are used as tools for studying the robust versions of the JL Lemma and the RIP. It is still not known whether any other types of matrices satisfying the SRIP. In particular the erasure robustness property of a ± 1 random matrix (i.e. a random matrix with i.i.d entries drawn from the random variable X which only takes values ± 1 and $\mathbb{P}(X = 1) = \mathbb{P}(X = -1) = \frac{1}{2}$) is of great interest, as this type together with the Gaussian random matrices are very common and important in the field of compressed sensing. Unfortunately not so many results about the ± 1 random matrices were developed. It was proved that a ± 1 random matrix is singular with positive probability (see [23]), however the tight estimate is still unknown. Therefore, one may expect an upper bound on the portion of rows erased such that the reduced ± 1 matrix still satisfies the RIP. In fact, it is not difficult to show that the erasure ratio cannot exceed $\frac{1}{2}$. In this paper we will prove that if the erasure ratio is below a certain number then the erased ± 1 matrix is still a good restricted isometry. To obtain the sharp upper bound, it turns out that significantly new ideas are required.

1.3. **Finite Frame Theory.** Another area closely connected to CS with corruptions is finite frame theory. In data processing, one commonly used technique is to decompose a given signal $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ via the following map

$$x \mapsto \{\langle x, f_k\rangle\}_{k=1}^n,$$

where $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^n$ with $n \geq m$ is a frame in $\mathbb{R}^m$, i.e. $\text{span}\{f_k : 1 \leq k \leq n\} = \mathbb{R}^m$. We consider the following problem: when transmitting signals through a channel with noise and adversarial erasures, it is natural to design a frame which is numerically stable so that it is possible to recover the signal even some data were lost or corrupted. To meet the requirements, we need to design a *numerically erasure robust frame* (NERF), which is a finite frame with bounded condition numbers under a fixed erasure ratio. This concept was introduced in [11]: Let $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}(n > m)$ be a finite frame such that any n rows form a basis of $\mathbb{R}^m$. Its *condition number* is defined as

$$Cond(F) = \frac{s_{\max}(F)}{s_{\min}(F)},$$

where $s_{\max}(F)$ and $s_{\min}(F)$ denote the largest and smallest singular values of F respectively. For $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\beta m \in \mathbb{N}$, if there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\max_{T\subseteq\{1,\ldots,n\},|T^c|=\beta n} Cond(F_T) \leq C,$$

then F is called a *numerically erasure robust frame* (NERF) of level (β, C). It turns out that the study of finite frames shares many similarities with CS with corruptions. Now we are interested in examples of NERF. In [11], the author proved that if a finite frame has entries drawn from i.i.d. Gaussian distributions and its size satisfies certain condition, then this frame is a NERF with overwhelming probability. Later in [26], it was claimed that the matrix size condition can be omitted thus the result about Gaussian random frames from [11] can be improved. Although the result claimed in [26] is true, but there are problems in the author's argument. The author tried to prove the following result which plays an essential role in the estimation of the smallest singular value of the Gaussian matrix:

Theorem 1.2. *(*[26, Theorem 1.2]*) Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}(N > n)$ whose entries are drawn independently from the standard normal distribution and $\eta = \frac{N}{n} > 1$. Then for any $\mu > 0$ there exists $c > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\min}(A) < c\sqrt{n}) < 2e^{-\mu n}.$$

To prove Theorem 1.2, the author applied an $\epsilon-$net argument and obtained

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\min}(A) < c\sqrt{n}) \leq (1 + 2\epsilon^{-1})^n \left(\frac{2e(c + \epsilon C)}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{N}{2}} + (1 + 2\epsilon^{-1})^n e^{-\frac{(C-1-\sqrt{\eta})^2}{2}n}, \tag{1}$$

where $C > 0$ depends on η and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. In order to bound the right hand side of (1) by $2e^{-\mu n}$, the author claimed that it suffices to have

$$-\mu \geq \ln(1 + 2\epsilon^{-1}) + \frac{\eta}{2}[\ln(2e) - \ln\eta + 2\ln(c + \epsilon C)], \tag{2}$$

$$-\mu \geq -\frac{1}{2}(C - 1 - \sqrt{\eta})^2, \tag{3}$$

which is problematic because in fact from (2) and (3) one cannot conclude that the right-hand side of (1) is bounded by $2e^{-\mu n}$. However if we replace (3) by

$$-\mu \geq \ln(1 + 2\epsilon^{-1}) - \frac{1}{2}(C - 1 - \sqrt{\eta})^2, \tag{4}$$

then one can conclude that $2e^{-\mu n}$ is an upper bound of the right-hand side of (1) from (2) and (4). Therefore the estimate of the smallest singular value given in Theorem 1.2 is

problematic. In this paper we will fix the mistake and deduce the correct bound on the smallest singular value. It turns out that the estimate will be significantly different if the correct inequality (4) is used.

1.4. **Contributions and the Structure of the Paper.** The structure of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 recalls the basic concepts and properties of random ± 1 variables, including concentration inequalities and order statistics results which are useful in our study. Section 3 will provide the study of robustness properties of random ± 1 matrices. We will focus on the following question: how large can the erasure ratio $\beta \in (0,1)$ be so that a random ± 1 matrix $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ with βn arbitrarily erased rows has the nearly isometry property with high probability. As a consequence we will establish the SRIP and the robust JL Lemma for random ± 1 matrices. Section 5 contains the results related to Gaussian finite frames, we will improve the results in [26] and provide the implicit forms of the bounds on condition numbers of the reduced matrices. Also we will provide some numerical simulation results. Finally a summary and further discussion are provided in Section 6.

2. On the ± 1 Random Variable

In this section we provide the necessary background on ± 1 random variables which will be used in our study of ± 1 random matrices.

2.1. **Sub-gaussian Random Variables.** One of the most important property of the ± 1 random variable is that its moment generating function (MGF) is dominated by the MGF of a Gaussian random variable. The class of such random variables are called *sub-gaussian* random variables, which plays important roles in the field of compressed sensing. We will first give the formal definition and some properties of sub-gaussian random variables. All definitions and results provided in this section are known (see e.g. [4]).

we begin with the formal definition of a sub-gaussian random variable:

Definition 2.1. A real random variable X is called $b-$*sub-gaussian* for some $b > 0$ if

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{tX}) \leq e^{\frac{b^2t^2}{2}}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{5}$$

Notation: $X \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b^2)$. We will always assume that b is the smallest positive number so that (5) holds.

With the definition above it is easy to observe that if X is a ± 1 random variable, then $X \sim \mathrm{Sub}(1)$.

It is straight forward to verify the following properties of sub-gaussian variables:

Proposition 2.2. *(i) If $X \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b^2)$, then X is centred, i.e. $\mathbb{E}(X) = 0$.*
(ii) If $X \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b^2)$, then $\mathrm{Var}(X) \leq b^2$.
(iii) If $X \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b^2)$, then for all $c \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $cX \sim \mathrm{Sub}(c^2b^2)$.
(iv) If $X_1 \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b_1^2)$ and $X_2 \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b_2^2)$, then $X_1 + X_2 \sim \mathrm{Sub}((b_1+b_2)^2)$. Moreover, if X_1, X_2 are independent, then $X_1 + X_2 \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b_1^2 + b_2^2)$.
(v) If $X = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_N)$ is a random vector such that X_i's are i.i.d. random variables with $X_i \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b^2)$, then for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we have

$$\langle X, \alpha \rangle \sim \mathrm{Sub}(\|\alpha\|_2^2 b^2).$$

The sub-gaussian random variables can be characterized in the following equivalent ways:

Theorem 2.3. *The following are equivalent for a centred random variable X:*
(i) $X \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b^2)$ for some $b > 0$.

(ii) For all $\lambda > 0$, there exists $c > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(|X| > \lambda) \leq 2e^{-c\lambda^2}$. In fact we may choose $c = \frac{1}{2b^2}$.

(iii) For every $\xi > 1$, there exists $a > 0$ depending on ξ such that $\mathbb{E}(e^{aX^2}) \leq \xi$. In fact, we can choose $a = \frac{\xi - 1}{2b^2(\xi+1)}$.

2.2. **Concentration of Measure Phenomena.** The concentration of measure phenomena is extremely important in the study of measure and probability theory, and has various applications and consequences in areas such as Banach space theory and random matrix theory. The concentration of measure for Gaussian matrices has been studied thoroughly in the past (see e.g. [17]). The most useful result is the Lipschitz concentration for Gaussian matrices, which has several applications in the study of CS.

First recall the concentration inequality for sub-gaussian matrices:

Theorem 2.4 (**Concentration of measure for sub-gaussian matrices**). *(*[9, Lemma 6.1]*) Suppose that $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ is a random matrix with i.i.d. entries such that each entry obeys* $\mathrm{Sub}(b^2)$ *and has variance $\frac{1}{n}$. Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we have:*

(i) $\mathbb{E}(\|Ax\|_2^2) = \|x\|_2^2$.

(ii) There exists $\kappa > 0$ (depending on the distribution) such that for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Ax\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2 > \epsilon\|x\|_2^2) < \exp(-\kappa\epsilon^2 n),$$
$$\mathbb{P}(\|Ax\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2 < -\epsilon\|x\|_2^2) < \exp(-\kappa\epsilon^2 n).$$

Remark 2.5. From [1], if $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ has entries drawn from i.i.d. ± 1 variables, then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{m}\|Ax\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2 > \epsilon\|x\|_2^2\right) < \exp\left(-\left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{4} - \frac{\epsilon^3}{6}\right)m\right),$$
$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{m}\|Ax\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2 < -\epsilon\|x\|_2^2\right) < \exp\left(-\left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{4} - \frac{\epsilon^3}{6}\right)m\right).$$

Thus in this case we may take $\kappa = \frac{1}{12}$.

We now establish the Lipschitz concentration inequality for sub-gaussian random variables. The Gaussian case had been proved in [16, Proposition 2.3], and use the same argument one can extend the result to arbitrary sub-gaussian random variables:

Theorem 2.6 (**Lipschitz concentration inequality for sub-gaussian distributions**). *Let $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ has i.i.d. entries with $X_i \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b^2)$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be a $1-$Lipschitz function, i.e. $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq \|x - y\|_2$, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then for all $t > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(f(X) - \mathbb{E}(f(X)) \geq t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{5b^2}\right),$$
$$\mathbb{P}(f(X) - \mathbb{E}(f(X)) \leq -t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{5b^2}\right).$$

2.3. **Order Statistics.** Finally we provide some results from order statistics which later will be used. Suppose $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ are i.i.d. random variables such that $y_j \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b^2)$. Let $S \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Define

$$F_S : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}, \quad x \mapsto \sqrt{\sum_{j\in S} x_{(j)}^2},$$

where $x_{(1)}, \ldots, x_{(|S|)}$ denotes the non-increasing rearrangements of elements in S in magnitudes, i.e. $|x_{(1)}| \geq \cdots \geq |x_{(|S|)}|$. Then it is easy to see that F_S is $1-$Lipschitz. So for

all $t > 0$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{|S|}\sum_{j\in S} y_{(j)}^2} \geq t + \mathbb{E}\sqrt{\frac{1}{|S|}\sum_{j\in S} y_{(j)}^2}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\sum_{j\in S} y_{(j)}^2} \geq t\sqrt{|S|} + \mathbb{E}\sqrt{\sum_{j\in S} y_{(j)}^2}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2|S|}{5b^2}\right).$$

Corollary 2.7. *Suppose that $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ are i.i.d. random variables with $y_i \sim \mathrm{Sub}(b^2)$. Let $y_{(1)}, \ldots, y_{(n)}$ be non-increasing rearrangements of y_i's in magnitudes, i.e. $|y_{(1)}| \geq \cdots \geq |y_{(n)}|$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} y_{(j)}^2}\right) \leq \sqrt{2eb^2 \ln\frac{en}{k}}.$$

Proof. Let $\xi > 1$ and choose $t = \frac{\xi-1}{2b^2(\xi+1)}$. It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} ty_{(j)}^2\right)\right) &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\mathbb{E}(ty_{(j)}^2)\right) \leq \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\exp(\mathbb{E}(ty_{(j)}^2)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\mathbb{E}(\exp(ty_{(j)}^2)) \leq \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}(\exp(ty_{(j)}^2)) \\
&= \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\exp(ty_j^2)\right) = \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\exp(ty_j^2)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}(\exp(ty_j^2)) \leq \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\xi \quad \text{(by (iii) of Theorem 2.3)} \\
&= \xi\frac{n}{k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking logarithms on both sides and using Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\sqrt{\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} y_{(j)}^2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2b^2(\xi+1)}{\xi-1}\ln\frac{\xi n}{k}}.$$

Setting $\xi = e$ yields the result. □

2.4. **The Linear Combinations of ± 1 Random Variables.** In order to study the ± 1 random matrices, it is necessary to have some knowledge on the linear combinations of ± 1 variables. One of the most famous result is the following:

Theorem 2.8 (**Khinchine's inequality**). *Let $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ be independent symmetric Bernoulli random variables. Then for $0 < p < \infty$, there exist $a(p), b(p) > 0$ depending only on p so that*

$$a(p)\|c\|_2 \leq \left(\mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_j X_j\right|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq b(p)\|c\|_2, \quad \forall c = (c_1, \ldots, c_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m.$$

$a(p)$ and $b(p)$ are called Khinchine constants.

The best Khinchine constants are given by Haagerup in [14] as follows:

Theorem 2.9. *The best constants $a(p)$ and $b(p)$ in Khinchine's inequality are given by*

$$b(p) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 < p \leq 2, \\ \sqrt{2}\left(\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & p > 2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$a(p) = \begin{cases} 2^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}}, & 0 < p \leq p_0, \\ \sqrt{2}\left(\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & p_0 < p < 2, \\ 1, & p \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

where $p_0 \in (0,2)$ satisfies $\Gamma\left(\frac{p_0+1}{2}\right) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}$.

With Khinchine's inequality and the optimal Khinchine constants, and use the same argument as in the proof of [3, Lemma 2.2], the following inequality about ± 1 random matrices is obtained:

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ be a random matrix with entries drawn from i.i.d ± 1 random variables, then for any $x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ and $0 < q < 1$:*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|Ax\|_2^2 \leq (\frac{1}{2} - q)n\right) < \exp\left(-\frac{q}{3}n\right).$$

3. ± 1 Random Matrices under Arbitrary Erasure of Rows with a Given Portion of Corruption

In this section we will study the erasure robustness of ± 1 random matrices for erasure ratio no more than a given number β. We will establish the strong restricted isometry property (SRIP) and the robust version of Johnson-Lindenstrauss (JL) lemma with a constant portion of corruption.
Throughout this section:

- $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ is a matrix with entries drawn from i.i.d ± 1 random variables. For $T \subseteq \{1, \dots n\}$, Φ_T denotes the sub matrix of Φ by keeping rows with indices in T.
- Given i.i.d. random variables $y_1, \dots, y_n$, then denote $y_{(1)}, \dots, y_{(n)}$ to be the non-increasing rearrangements of y_i's in magnitude, i.e. $|y_{(1)}| \geq \cdots \geq |y_{(n)}|$.

Fix $x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$, for $\beta \in [0,1), 0 \leq \theta \leq \omega \leq \infty$, set

$$\Omega_{[\theta,\omega],\beta} = \left\{\frac{1}{|T|}\|\Phi_T x\|_2^2 \in [\theta,\omega] \quad \forall T \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}, |T^c| \leq \beta n\right\},$$

$$\tilde{\Omega}_{[\theta,\omega],\beta} = \left\{\frac{1}{n}\|\Phi_T x\|_2^2 \in [\theta,\omega] \quad \forall T \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}, |T^c| \leq \beta n\right\}.$$

For $\beta \in (0,1), \alpha > 0$, define

$$\theta_\beta(\alpha) = \sup\{\theta \in [0,\infty] : \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{[\theta,\infty],\beta}) \geq 1 - e^{-\alpha n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\},$$
$$\omega_\beta(\alpha) = \inf\{\omega \in [0,\infty] : \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{[0,\omega],\beta}) \geq 1 - e^{-\alpha n} \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}\},$$
$$\tilde{\theta}_\beta(\alpha) = \sup\{\theta \in [0,\infty] : \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_{[\theta,\infty],\beta}) \geq 1 - e^{-\alpha n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\},$$
$$\tilde{\omega}_\beta(\alpha) = \inf\{\omega \in [0,\infty] : \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_{[0,\omega],\beta}) \geq 1 - e^{-\alpha n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

By studying these quantities, we get the lower and upper bounds of the norm after the reduced sub-gaussian matrix acting on a vector, and thus enables us to determine the constants in the SRIP.

3.1. **Estimates of $\theta_\beta(\alpha)$, $\tilde{\theta}_\beta(\alpha)$, $\omega_\beta(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{\omega}_\beta(\alpha)$.**

Lemma 3.1 (**Lower estimates of $\theta_\beta(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{\theta}_\beta(\alpha)$**). *For $\beta \in (0, t_{ber})$ and $\alpha \in \left(0, \ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right) + \frac{q_\beta}{3}(1-\beta)\right)$, we have*

$$\theta_\beta(\alpha) \geq \min\left\{\frac{1}{2} - 3(1-\beta)^{-1}\left[\alpha - \ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right)\right], 1-\alpha\right\},$$

$$\tilde{\theta}_\beta(\alpha) \geq (1-\beta)\min\left\{\frac{1}{2} - 3(1-\beta)^{-1}\left[\alpha - \ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right)\right], 1-\alpha\right\},$$

where $t_{\pm 1} \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ satisfies

$$(1-t_{\pm 1})\ln(1-t_{\pm 1}) + t_{ber}\ln(t_{\pm 1}) + \frac{1}{6}(1-t_{\pm 1}) = 0.$$

The numerical solution is $t_{ber} \approx 0.0376$, and $q_\beta \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ is given by

$$q_\beta = \sup\{q \in (0,1) : (1-\beta)\ln(1-\beta) + \beta\ln(\beta) + \frac{q}{3}(1-\beta) > 0\}.$$

Proof. Recall that for $\theta > 0$, $\beta \in (0,1)$, $x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$:

$$\Omega_{[\theta,\infty],\beta} = \left\{\frac{1}{|T|}\|\Phi_T x\|_2^2 \geq \theta, \quad \forall T \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}, |T^c| \leq \beta n\right\}.$$

For $\alpha > 0$, we want to choose θ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega^c_{[\theta,\infty],\beta}) < \exp(-\alpha n).$$

Let $|T^c| = k \leq \beta n$ and $\gamma = k/n$.Then by Lemma 2.10 we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\Phi_T x\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(n-k) - q\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{q}{3}\right), \quad \forall 0 < q < \frac{1}{2}(n-k).$$

Now for any $0 < q < \frac{1}{2}(n-k)$, set $q_T = \frac{q}{|T|} = \frac{q}{n-k}$. Then we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\Phi_T x\|_2^2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - q_T\right)(n-k)\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{q_T}{3}(n-k)\right),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{|T|}\|\Phi_T x\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} - q_T\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{q_T}{3}(1-\gamma)n\right). \tag{6}$$

Recall the Stirling's approximation:

$$\sqrt{2\pi}n^{n+\frac{1}{2}}e^{-n} \leq n! \leq en^{n+\frac{1}{2}}e^{-n}. \tag{7}$$

Therefore for $k \geq 1$:

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{(n-k)!k!} \leq \frac{e}{2\pi}\left(\frac{n}{n-k}\right)^{n-k}\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^k\left(\frac{n}{(n-k)k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}\pi}\left(\frac{n}{n-k}\right)^{nm-k}\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^k.$$

Now consider two cases:

- If $\lfloor \beta m \rfloor = 0$, then

  $$\mathbb{P}(\Omega^c_{[\theta,\infty],\beta}) = \mathbb{P}\left(\|\Phi x\|^2 < \theta n\right) \leq \exp\left(-\left(\frac{1}{2} - \theta\right)n\right),$$

  for all $\theta \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$. Then simply choose $\theta \leq \frac{1}{2} - \alpha$ we will have $\mathbb{P}(\Omega^c_{[\theta,\infty],\beta}) < \exp(-\alpha n)$.
- If $\lfloor \beta n \rfloor \geq 1$: observe that

  $$\mathbb{P}(\Omega^c_{[\theta,\infty],\beta}) = \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{|T^c|=\beta n}\frac{1}{|T|}\|\Phi_T x\|_2^2 < \frac{1}{2} - q_\beta\right).$$

Without loss of generality assume $\beta n =: k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have

$$\binom{n}{k} \leq \left(\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}\pi}\right)\left(\frac{1}{1-\beta}\right)^{(1-\beta)n}\left(\frac{1}{\beta}\right)^{\beta n} = \left(\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}\pi}\right)\exp\left(n\ln\left((1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)}\beta^{-\beta}\right)\right).$$

As (6) holds for all $|T^c| = k$, it follows that for any $q \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{|T^c|=k}\frac{1}{|T|}\|\Phi_T x\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} - q\right) \\
\leq &\binom{n}{k}\exp\left(-\frac{q}{3}(1-\beta)n\right) \\
\leq &\left(\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}\pi}\right)\exp\left[n\ln\left((1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)}\beta^{-\beta}\right) - \frac{q}{3}(1-\beta)n\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Now we want to bound $\mathbb{P}(\Omega^c_{[\theta,\infty],\beta})$ by $C\exp(-\alpha n)$ where C is an absolute constant independent of n. Then it suffices to have $C = \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}\pi}$ and

$$\ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^{\beta}\right) + \frac{q}{3}(1-\beta) \geq \alpha. \tag{8}$$

For $q \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, define

$$f_q(t) = \ln\left((1-t)^{1-t}t^t\right) + \frac{q}{3}(1-t) \tag{9}$$

Then it is easy to see that $f_q'(t) < 0$ whenever $t < \frac{\exp\left(\frac{q}{3}\right)}{1+\exp\left(\frac{q}{3}\right)}$. As $\frac{\exp\left(\frac{q}{3}\right)}{1+\exp\left(\frac{q}{3}\right)} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, it follows that $f_q(t)$ is strictly decreasing on $\left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, and

$$f_q\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \ln\frac{1}{2} + \frac{q}{6} \leq -\ln 2 + \frac{1}{12} < 0.$$

On the other hand, note that

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} f_q(t) = q > 0.$$

It follows that f_q has a unique root on $\left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, and call this root t_q. Since we require the left-hand side of (8) to be strictly positive, this forces that $\beta < t_q$.

It is easy to see that $\lim_{q\to 0^+} t_q = 0$. Now consider

$$(1-t_q)\ln(1-t_q) + t_q\ln(t_q) + \frac{q}{3}(1-t_q) = 0.$$

If we choose $q' \geq q$, then we will have

$$(1-t_q)\ln(1-t_q) + t_q\ln(t_q) + \frac{q'}{3}(1-t_q) \geq 0,$$

and as $f_{q'}(t)$ is strictly decreasing on $\left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, it follows that $t_{q'} \geq t_q$, i.e. t_q increases as q increases, and

$$\lim_{q\to\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^-} t_q =: t_{\pm 1} < (1+e^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}. \tag{10}$$

Thus $\lim_{q\to\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^-} f_q(t_{\pm 1}) = 0$. As $f_q(t)$ is continuous in both t, q, it follows from (9) and (10) that

$$(1-t_{\pm 1})\ln(1-t_{\pm 1}) + t_{\pm 1}\ln(t_{\pm 1}) + \frac{1}{6}(1-t_{\pm 1}) = 0.$$

On the other hand, as $f_q(t)$ is continuous in both variables (t, q), it follows that for any $0 < t < t_{sg}$, there is $0 < q < \frac{1}{2}$ such that $f_q(t) = 0$, and therefore $f_{q'}(t) > 0$ for all $q < q' < \frac{1}{2}$.

Thus for any $\beta \in (0, t_{sg})$, there is $0 < q_\beta < \frac{1}{2}$ such that

$$(1-\beta)\ln(1-\beta) + \beta\ln(\beta) + \frac{q_\beta}{3}(1-\beta) > 0.$$

So we can choose α in between such that

$$q_\beta \geq 3(1-\beta)^{-1}\left[\alpha - \ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right)\right].$$

Therefore, if $\theta \leq \frac{1}{2} - 3(1-\beta)^{-1}\left[\alpha - \ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right)\right]$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega^c_{[\theta,\infty],\beta}) \leq \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}\pi}\exp(-\alpha n).$$

So by the two cases above, we have

$$\alpha < \min\left\{\ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right) + \frac{q_\beta}{3}(1-\beta), \frac{1}{2}\right\},$$

and

$$\theta \leq \min\left\{\frac{1}{2} - (1-\beta)^{-1}\left[\alpha - \ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right)\right], \frac{1}{2} - \alpha\right\}.$$

As f_{q_β} is decreasing on $(0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\lim_{t\to 0^+} f_{q_\beta}(t) = q_\beta < \frac{1}{2}$, it follows that

$$\ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right) + q_\beta(1-\beta) < \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall 0 < \beta < t_{\pm 1} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus $\alpha < \ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right) + \frac{q_\beta}{3}(1-\beta)$.

For the lower estimate of $\tilde{\theta}_\beta(\alpha)$, first observe that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} y^2_{(j)} = \frac{n-k}{n}\frac{1}{n-k}\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} y^2_{(j)} = \frac{1-\gamma}{n-k}\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} y^2_{(j)},$$

it follows that for $\theta \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_{[\theta,\infty],\beta}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{T\in T_\gamma}\frac{1}{n}\|\Phi_T x\|_2^2 \geq \theta\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} y^2_{(j)} \geq \theta\right)\\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n-k}\sum_{j=k+1}^{n} y^2_{(j)}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\theta}{1-\gamma}}\right) = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\left[\frac{\theta}{1-\gamma},\infty\right],\beta}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\left[\frac{\theta}{1-\beta},\infty\right],\beta}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\tilde{\theta}_\beta(\alpha) \geq (1-\beta)\theta_\beta(\alpha)$ and the lower estimate of $\tilde{\theta}_\beta(\alpha)$ follows immediately.

□

To obtain the upper estimates of $\theta_\beta(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{\theta}_\beta(\alpha)$, we can use same argument in the proof of [15, Lemma 4.1] with only a little modification, and the result thus becomes the following:

Lemma 3.2 (**Upper estimates of** $\theta_\beta(\alpha)$ **and** $\tilde{\theta}_\beta(\alpha)$). *For* $\beta \in (0,1)$ *and* $\alpha \in (0,1)$, *we have* $\theta_\beta(\alpha) \leq 1$ *and* $\tilde{\theta}_\beta(\alpha) \leq 1-\beta$.

Now we are left to estimate $\omega_\beta(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{\omega}_\beta(\alpha)$. One can easily verify that the arguments are the same as in the Gaussian case from section 4 of [15] only up to slight modifications.

Theorem 3.3 (**Estimates of $\omega_\beta(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{\omega}_\beta(\alpha)$**). *For $\beta \in (0,1)$ and $\alpha > 0$, we have*

$$\left(\sqrt{\frac{5b^2\alpha}{1-\beta}} + \sqrt{2eb^2 \ln \frac{e}{1-\beta}}\right)^2 \geq \omega_\beta(\alpha) \geq \begin{cases} 1, & \beta n < 1 \\ \frac{1}{1-\frac{\beta}{2}}, & \beta n \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

$$1 \leq \tilde{\omega}_\beta(\alpha) \leq 1 + \sqrt{12\alpha}.$$

3.2. **The Strong Restricted Isometry Property of ± 1 Random Matrices.** With the estimates provided in section 2.1, we are almost there to prove the main results on the erasure robustness property of ± 1 random matrices. We still need one more result (see e.g. [18]):

Lemma 3.4. *Let $S \subseteq \{1, \ldots, m\}$ with $|S| = s$. Set*

$$\mathbb{S}_S^{m-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1} : \operatorname{supp}(x) \subseteq S\}.$$

Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an $\epsilon-$net $Q_{S,\epsilon} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_S^{m-1}$ satisfying

- $\mathbb{S}_S^{m-1} \subseteq \bigcup_{q \in Q_{S,\epsilon}} B_{\frac{\epsilon}{8}}(q)$.
- $|Q_{S,\epsilon}| \leq \left(\frac{24}{\epsilon}\right)^s$.

We are now ready to establish the strong restricted isometry property of ± 1 random matrices.

Theorem 3.5 (**Strong restricted isometry property for ± 1 matrices**). *Let $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be a random matrix with entries drawn from i.i.d ± 1 random variables. Let $\beta \in (0, t_{\pm 1})$ and $\alpha \in \left(0, \min\left\{\ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right) + \frac{q_\beta}{3}(1-\beta), \frac{1}{12}\right\}\right)$ where $t_{\pm 1}$ and q_β are the same as in Lemma 3.1. Let $s, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ be such that*

$$s \ln \frac{24en}{\epsilon s} < \alpha m - \ln 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_\epsilon := \sqrt{\tilde{\theta}} - \frac{\epsilon}{8}\sqrt{\tilde{\omega}} > 0,$$

where

$$\tilde{\theta} = (1-\beta) \min\left\{\frac{1}{2} - 3(1-\beta)^{-1}\left[\alpha - \ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right)\right], \frac{1}{2} - \alpha\right\},$$

$$\tilde{\omega} = 1 + \sqrt{12\alpha},$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\theta_\epsilon \|u\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{n}\|A_T u\|_2^2 \leq \tilde{\omega}(1+2\epsilon)\|u\|_2^2, \quad \forall |\operatorname{supp}(u)| \leq s, |T^c| \leq \beta n\right) \\ \geq &1 - 2\left(\frac{24em}{\epsilon s}\right)^s \exp(-\alpha n), \\ &\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\theta_\epsilon}{1-\beta}\|u\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{|T|}\|A_T u\|_2^2 \leq \omega(1+2\epsilon)\|u\|_2^2, \quad \forall |\operatorname{supp}(u)| \leq s, |T^c| \leq \beta n\right) \\ \geq &1 - 2\left(\frac{24em}{\epsilon s}\right)^s \exp(-\alpha n), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\theta_\epsilon := \left(\sqrt{\tilde{\theta}} - \frac{\epsilon}{8}\sqrt{\tilde{\omega}}\right)^2,$$

$$\omega = \left(\sqrt{\frac{5\alpha}{1-\beta}} + \sqrt{2e \ln \frac{e}{1-\beta}}\right)^2.$$

Proof. The structure is similar to the proof of [[25], Theorem 2.1] and the main idea is borrowed from the proof of Lemma 5.1 in [2].

Let $T \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ be such that $|T^c| \leq \beta n$. By Lemma 3.1 and 3.3, with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\alpha n}$ we have

$$\sqrt{\tilde{\theta}(1-\epsilon)}\|u\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|A_T u\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\tilde{\omega}(1+\epsilon)}\|u\|_2.$$

Let S, $\mathbb{S}_S^{n-1}$ and $Q_{S,\epsilon}$ be the same as in Lemma 3.4. Define

$$d = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|A_T u\|_2, u \in \mathbb{S}_S^{m-1}, |T^c| \leq \beta n\right\}.$$

For any $u \in \mathbb{S}_S^{n-1}$, there is $v_u \in Q_{S,\epsilon}$ such that $\|u - v_u\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{8}$. Hence

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|A_T u\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|A_T v_u\|_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|A_T u - v_u\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\tilde{\omega}(1+\epsilon)} + \frac{d\epsilon}{8}.$$

By definition of d:

$$d \leq \sqrt{\tilde{\omega}(1+\epsilon)} + \frac{d\epsilon}{8} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad d \leq \sqrt{\tilde{\omega}(1+2\epsilon)}.$$

On the other hand

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|A_T u\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|A_T v_u\|_2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|A_T u - v_u\|_2 \geq \sqrt{\tilde{\theta}} - \frac{\epsilon}{8}\sqrt{\tilde{\omega}}.$$

Choose $\epsilon > 0$ small enough such that $\sqrt{\tilde{\theta}} - \frac{\epsilon}{8}\sqrt{\tilde{\omega}} > 0$, and set

$$\theta_\epsilon := \left(\sqrt{\tilde{\theta}} - \frac{\epsilon}{8}\sqrt{\tilde{\omega}}\right)^2.$$

Thus with probability at least $1 - 2\left(\frac{24}{\epsilon}\right)^s \exp(-\alpha n)$, we have

$$\sqrt{\theta_\epsilon}\|u\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|A_T u\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\tilde{\omega}(1+2\epsilon)}\|u\|_2,$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\operatorname{supp}(u) \subseteq S$ and $|T^c| \leq \beta n$.

As there are $\binom{m}{s}$ subsets of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ with cardinality s, then by the union bound argument and Stirling's approximation $\binom{m}{s} \leq \left(\frac{em}{s}\right)^s$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\theta_\epsilon}\|u\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|A_T u\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\tilde{\omega}(1+2\epsilon)}\|u\|_2, \quad \forall |\operatorname{supp}(u)| \leq s, |T^c| \leq \beta n\right) \\
\geq &1 - 2\left(\frac{24em}{\epsilon s}\right)^s \exp(-\alpha n),
\end{aligned}$$

provided $s \ln \frac{24em}{\epsilon s} < \alpha n - \ln 2$.

Similarly we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{1-\beta}(1-2\epsilon)}\|u\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{|T|}}\|A_T u\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\omega(1+2\epsilon)}\|u\|_2, \quad \forall |\operatorname{supp}(u)| \leq s, |T^c| \leq \beta n\right) \\
\geq &1 - 2\left(\frac{24emn}{\epsilon s}\right)^s \exp(-\alpha n).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the proof is complete. □

Another result we can establish is the following robust version of Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma:

Theorem 3.6 (**Robust Johnson-Lindenstrauss Lemma with a given erasure ratio**). *Let $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ be a random matrix with entries drawn from i.i.d ± 1 random variables. Let $\beta \in (0, t_{\pm 1})$ and $\alpha \in \left(0, \min\left\{\ln\left((1-\beta)^{1-\beta}\beta^\beta\right) + \frac{q_\beta}{16b}(1-\beta), \frac{1}{12}\right\}\right)$ where $t_{\pm 1}$*

and q_β are defined as in Lemma 3.1. Let $N, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that

$$n > \alpha^{-1} \ln \frac{1}{N(N-1)}.$$

For any set of N points $p_1, \dots, p_N$ in $\mathbb{R}^m$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\tilde{\theta}\|p_j - p_k\|_2^2 \le \frac{1}{n}\|A_T(p_j - p_k)\|_2^2 \le \tilde{\omega}\|p_j - p_k\|_2^2, \quad \forall |T^c| \le \beta n, 1 \le j, k \le N, j \ne k\right\}$$
$$\ge 1 - N(N-1)\exp(-\alpha n),$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{1-\beta}\|p_j - p_k\|_2^2 \le \frac{1}{|T|}\|A_T(p_j - p_k)\|_2^2 \le \omega\|p_j - p_k\|_2^2, \quad \forall |T^c| \le \beta n, 1 \le j, k \le N, j \ne k\right\}$$
$$\ge 1 - N(N-1)\exp(-\alpha n),$$

where $\tilde{\theta}$, $\tilde{\omega}$ and ω are given in Theorem 3.5.

Proof. Same as the proof of [15, Corollary 1.5]. □

4. Gaussian Random Frames

In this section we study the robustness properties of Gaussian random finite frames with fixed erasure ratio. The setting is slightly different from previous discussion, we will only consider matrices with more rows than columns, where as in CS more often we have the sensing matrix with more columns. As mentioned before, the study of the finite frame theory shares several similarities with the study of CS with corruptions. In this paper, as a starter, we focus on the Gaussian case mainly because this is the most special and important case among all random matrices.
Given a random matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ $(n > m)$ with i.i.d. standard normal entries, and given a fixed erasure ratio $\beta \in (0, \lambda)$ where $\lambda = 1 - \frac{m}{n} > 0$. For the study of finite frames, we care about the case which exactly βn rows are erased. In this section we will show that an $m \times n$ Gaussian frame is a NERF of level (β, C) for any $\beta \in (0, \lambda)$ and $C > 0$ depending only on β with overwhelming probability. We will improve existing results shown in [26] by using more accurate estimates.

Throughout this section we use the following symbols to denote the following quantities:

- A is an $n \times m$ $(n > m)$ random matrix with i.i.d standard normal entries,
- $\lambda = 1 - \frac{m}{n}$ is the redundancy rate,
- $s_{\max}(A)$ and $s_{\min}(A)$ denotes the largest and smallest singular value of a matrix A respectively.

4.1. The Extreme Singular Values of Gaussian Matrices.

We begin with estimating the largest singular value of a Gaussian matrix with certain portion of rows erased. We use the following well-known result:

Lemma 4.1. *([24, Corollary 5.35]) We have*

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\max}(A) \ge \sqrt{n} + \sqrt{m} + t) \le e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}, \quad \forall t \ge 0.$$

Then we can prove the following estimate of the largest singular value of a Gaussian matrix:

Theorem 4.2 (**The largest singular value**). *For any $\alpha > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(s_{\max}(A) \ge r(\alpha, \lambda)\sqrt{m}\right) \le e^{-\alpha m},$$

where

$$r(\alpha, \lambda) = (1-\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 1 + \sqrt{2\alpha}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.1:

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\max}(A) \geq ((1-\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}}+1)\sqrt{n}+t) \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Thus for any $\alpha > 0$, setting $t = \sqrt{2\alpha n}$ yields the claim. □

Next we give the estimate of the smallest singular value of the reduced Gaussian matrix. Our analysis is based on the arguments from section 2 in [26]. First we need to estimate the probability of the following event: $\{\|Ax\|_2^2 \leq t\}$ with $x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ fixed and certain $t > 0$. We have the following lemma:

Lemma 4.3. *For any fixed $x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ and $\alpha > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Ax\|_2^2 \leq q(\alpha,\lambda)m) \leq e^{-\alpha m},$$

where

$$q(\alpha,\lambda) = -(1-\lambda)^{-1}W_0(-e^{-2\alpha(1-\lambda)-\frac{6}{5}}),$$

and W_0 denotes the principal branch of the Lambert W function.

Proof. For $t > 0$, as shown in [Lemma 2.1, [26]] we can estimate $\mathbb{P}(\|Ax\|_2^2 \leq t)$ directly because if $x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$, then $\|Ax\|_2^2$ has the χ^2 distribution with n degrees of freedom with the density function

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}x^{\frac{n}{2}-1}e^{-\frac{x}{2}}.$$

Our proof will include more accurate estimate than the estimate in [Lemma 2.1, [26]].

For $t > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Ax\|_2^2 \leq t) = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}\int_0^t x^{\frac{n}{2}-1}e^{-\frac{x}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}\int_0^{\frac{t}{2}} x^{\frac{n}{2}-1}e^{-x}\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{\gamma(\frac{n}{2},\frac{t}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})},$$

where

$$\gamma(s,z) = \int_0^z x^{s-1}e^{-x}\,\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\frac{z^{s+i}e^{-z}}{s(s+1)\dots(s+i)}$$

denotes the lower incomplete gamma function. Let $q \in (0,(1-\lambda)^{-1}]$ and $t = qm \leq n$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma\left(\frac{n}{2},\frac{t}{2}\right) &= \left(\frac{2}{n}\right)\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}e^{-\frac{t}{2}}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\frac{(\frac{t}{2})^i}{(\frac{n-k}{2}+1)\dots(\frac{n-k}{2}+i)} \leq \left(\frac{2}{n}\right)\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}e^{-\frac{t}{2}}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\frac{t}{2}}{\frac{n}{2}+1}\right)^i \\ &= \left(\frac{2}{n}\right)\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}e^{-\frac{t}{2}}\frac{1}{1-\frac{t}{n+2}} = \left(\frac{2}{n}\right)\left(\frac{n+2}{n+2-t}\right)\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}e^{-\frac{t}{2}} \leq 3\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}e^{-\frac{t}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds whenever $(n-k) \geq 1$. Also note that we require $t \leq n$ when we estimate the infinite sum above, which forces $q \leq (1-\lambda)^{-1}$. Now we estimate $\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})$. Recall the Stirling's approximation $\Gamma(z+1) \geq \sqrt{2\pi z}(\frac{z}{e})^z$, thus

$$\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) \geq \left(\frac{2}{n}\right)\sqrt{\pi n}\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}e^{-\frac{n}{2}} = 2\sqrt{2\pi}\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}e^{-\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\|Ax\|_2^2 \le t) &\le \frac{\gamma\left(\frac{n}{2},\frac{t}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)} \le 3\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\frac{t}{2}} \frac{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{-\frac{n}{2}+\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{n}{2}}}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \\ &\le \frac{3}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\frac{t}{2}} e^{\frac{1}{10}n+\frac{1}{2}n} \quad (\text{as } \sqrt{x} \le e^{\frac{x}{5}} \text{ for all } x>0) \\ &= \frac{3}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} e^{\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{6}{5}n-t\right)} \le (q(1-\lambda))^{\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(\frac{n}{2}(-q+\frac{6}{5})\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{m}{2}(1-\lambda)^{-1}\left(\ln(q(1-\lambda)) - q(1-\lambda) + \frac{6}{5}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$g(q) = \frac{1}{2}(1-\lambda)^{-1}\left(\ln(q(1-\lambda)) - q + \frac{6}{5}\right).$$

Observe that $g(q(\alpha,\lambda)) = \alpha$ with

$$q(\alpha,\lambda) = -(1-\lambda)^{-1} W_0(-e^{-2\alpha(1-\lambda)-\frac{6}{5}}),$$

where W_0 denotes the principal branch of the Lambert W function. Hence for any $\alpha > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Ax\|_2^2 \le q(\alpha,\lambda)m) \le e^{-\alpha m}.$$

Thus the proof is complete. □

Remark 4.4. Recall that W_0 satisfies

$$W_0(z)e^{W_0(z)} = z, \quad \forall z \ge -e^{-1}.$$

Moreover, W_0 is an increasing function on $[-e^{-1},\infty)$ with $W_0(0) = 0$ and $W_0(-e^{-1}) = -1$. Thus $-W_0(z) \in (0,1)$ whenever $z \in (-e^{-1},0)$, so the number $q(\alpha,\lambda)$ in Lemma 4.3 automatically satisfies $q(\alpha,\lambda) \in (0,(1-\lambda)^{-1})$.

To estimate the smallest singular value, we need to introduce the concept of $\epsilon-$nets. Recall that for $\epsilon > 0$, a subset N_ϵ of $\mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ is called an *$\epsilon-$net* if for any $x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ there exists $v \in N_\epsilon$ so that $\|x-v\|_2 \le \epsilon$.

Lemma 4.5. *([24, Lemma 5.2]) For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $\epsilon-$net $N_\epsilon \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ so that $|N_\epsilon| \le (1+2\epsilon^{-1})^m$.*

The last supporting lemma we need to estimate the smallest singular value is the following result:

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\lambda \in (0,1)$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Define*

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_\alpha(\epsilon) &= \alpha + \ln(1+2\epsilon^{-1}), \\ r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda) &= (1-\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 1 + \sqrt{2\mu_\alpha(\epsilon)}, \\ q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda) &= -(1-\lambda)^{-1} W_0(-e^{-2\mu_\alpha(\epsilon)(1-\lambda)-\frac{6}{5}}).\end{aligned}$$

Then there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(\alpha,\lambda) > 0$ depending only on λ and α such that

$$\sqrt{q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)} > \epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda). \tag{11}$$

Proof. By Remark 4.4 we have

$$\lim_{z\to 0}\frac{W_0(z)}{z} = \lim_{z\to 0} e^{-W_0(z)} = 1.$$

It follows that in this case as ϵ approaches 0, we have

$$q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda) \sim (1-\lambda)^{-1} e^{-2(\alpha+\ln(1+2\epsilon^{-1}))(1-\lambda)-\frac{6}{5}} \sim \epsilon^{2(1-\lambda)}.$$

Therefore $\sqrt{q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)} \sim \epsilon^{1-\lambda}$. On the other hand it is easy to see that

$$\epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda) \sim \epsilon + \epsilon\sqrt{\ln(\epsilon^{-2})}.$$

As $\lambda > 0$, it follows that

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \frac{\epsilon^{1-\lambda}}{\epsilon + \epsilon\sqrt{\ln(\epsilon^{-2})}} = +\infty.$$

Thus in this case $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \frac{\sqrt{q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)}}{\epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)} = +\infty$. Hence certainly there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(\alpha,\lambda) > 0$ such that (11) holds. □

Now we are at the stage to prove the estimate of the smallest singular value of a Gaussian matrix. We have the following result:

Theorem 4.7 (**The smallest singular value**). *Suppose that $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ $(n > m)$is a random matrix with i.i.d. standard normal entries and $\lambda = 1 - \frac{m}{n} > 0$. For $\alpha > 0$, let $q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)$ and $r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)$ be the same as in Lemma 4.6. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(s_{\min}(A) \le p(\alpha,\lambda)\sqrt{n}\right) \le 2e^{-\alpha n},$$

where

$$p(\alpha,\lambda) = \sup_{\epsilon\in(0,1)} \sqrt{q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)} - \epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda) > 0.$$

Proof. For $\epsilon > 0$, let $N_\epsilon \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ be an $\epsilon-$net. Let $\alpha > 0$ and $v \in N_\epsilon$. Let $x \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$, choose $v_x \in N_\epsilon$ such that $\|x - v_x\|_2 \le \epsilon$. It follows that

$$\|Ax\|_2 \ge \|Av_x\|_2 - \|A(x - v_x)\|_2 \ge \|Av_x\|_2 - \epsilon s_{\max}(A).$$

Let $\alpha > 0$. Then for any $p > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\min}(A) \le p\sqrt{m}) \le \sum_{v\in N_\epsilon} \mathbb{P}(\|Av\|_2 \le p\sqrt{m} + \epsilon s_{\max}(A))$$

$$\le \sum_{v\in N_\epsilon} \left(\mathbb{P}(\|Av\|_2 \le p\sqrt{m} + \epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)\sqrt{m}) + \mathbb{P}(s_{\max}(A) \ge r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)\sqrt{m})\right).$$

By Lemma 4.6 we may choose $\epsilon = \epsilon(\alpha,\lambda) > 0$ such that

$$p_\epsilon(\alpha,\lambda) := \sqrt{q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)} - \epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda) > 0.$$

It follows from Lemma 4.3 that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Av\|_2 \le p_\epsilon(\alpha,\lambda)\sqrt{m} + \epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)\sqrt{m}) = \mathbb{P}\left(\|Av\|_2 \le \sqrt{q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)m}\right) \le e^{-\mu_\alpha(\epsilon)m}.$$

On the other hand by Theorem 4.2 we have

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\max}(A) \ge r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)\sqrt{m}) \le e^{-\mu_\alpha(\epsilon)m}.$$

Hence by Lemma 4.5 we have

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\min}(A) \le p_\epsilon(\alpha,\lambda)\sqrt{m}) \le \sum_{v\in N_\epsilon} 2e^{-\mu_\alpha(\epsilon)n} \le 2(1 + 2\epsilon^{-1})^n e^{-\mu_\alpha(\epsilon)m} = 2e^{-\alpha m}.$$

By setting

$$p(\alpha,\lambda) := \sup_{\epsilon>0} \sqrt{q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)} - \epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda) > 0,$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\min}(A) \le p(\alpha,\lambda)\sqrt{m}) \le 2e^{-\alpha m}.$$

We are left to show that

$$p(\alpha,\lambda) = \sup_{\epsilon\in(0,1)} \sqrt{q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda)} - \epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon),\lambda) > 0. \tag{12}$$

By Remark 4.4, $|W_0(z)| \leq 1$ for all $z \in [-e^{-1}, 1)$. Thus $\sqrt{q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon), \lambda)} \leq (1-\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0,1)$. On the other hand it is easy to see that $\epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon), \lambda) > (1-\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ whenever $\epsilon \geq 1$. It follows that $p_\epsilon(\alpha, \lambda) < 0$ whenever $\epsilon \geq 1$. Moreover by Lemma 4.6 we can choose $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ sufficiently small such that $p_\epsilon(\alpha, \lambda) > 0$. It follows from the definition of $p(\alpha, \lambda)$ that

$$p(\alpha, \lambda) = \sup_{\epsilon \in (0,1)} p_\epsilon(\alpha, \lambda) > 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

4.2. **Main Result.** Now we are at the stage to set up the main theorem for this chapter. We are going to show that a Gaussian random finite frame is a NERF with overwhelming probability.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be a random matrix with i.i.d. standard normal entries. Let $\lambda = 1 - \frac{m}{n} > 0$. Then for any $\beta \in (0, \lambda)$ such that $\beta n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu > 0$, A is a NERF of level $(\beta, \frac{R(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}{P(\nu,\lambda,\beta)})$ with probability at least $1 - 3e^{-\nu m}$ where*

$$P(\nu, \lambda, \beta) := \sup_{\epsilon \in (0,1)} \sqrt{q(\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon), \lambda(\beta))} - \epsilon r(\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}, \lambda(\beta)),$$

$$R(\nu, \lambda, \beta) = (1 - \lambda(\beta))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 1 + \sqrt{2\alpha(\nu, \lambda, \beta)},$$

$$\alpha(\nu, \lambda, \beta) = \nu + (1-\lambda)^{-1} \ln[\beta^{-\beta}(1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)}],$$

$$\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon) = \alpha(\nu, \lambda, \beta) + \ln(1 + 2\epsilon^{-1}),$$

$$r(\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon), \lambda(\beta)) = (1 - \lambda(\beta))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 1 + \sqrt{2\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon)},$$

$$q(\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon), \lambda(\beta)) = -(1-\lambda(\beta))^{-1} W_0(-e^{-2\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon)(1-\lambda(\beta))-\frac{6}{5}}),$$

$$\lambda(\beta) = 1 - \frac{m}{(1-\beta)n} = \frac{\lambda - \beta}{1 - \beta}.$$

All quantities above are positive.

Proof. Let $\alpha > 0$ and $T \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ with $|T^c| = \beta m$. Note that A_T is an $(n - \beta n) \times m$ matrix with i.i.d. standard normal entries. Define

$$\lambda(\beta) = 1 - \frac{m}{(1-\beta)n} = \frac{\lambda - \beta}{1 - \beta}.$$

Thus by Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.7 we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(s_{\min}(A_T) \leq p(\alpha, \lambda(\beta))\sqrt{m}\right) \leq 2e^{-\alpha m},$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(s_{\max}(A_T) \geq r(\alpha, \lambda(\beta))\sqrt{m}\right) \leq e^{-\alpha m},$$

where

$$p(\alpha, \lambda(\beta)) := \sup_{\epsilon \in (0,1)} \sqrt{q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon), \lambda(\beta))} - \epsilon r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon), \lambda(\beta)),$$

$$r(\alpha, \lambda(\beta)) = (1 - \lambda(\beta))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 1 + \sqrt{2\alpha},$$

$$\mu_\alpha(\epsilon) = \alpha + \ln(1 + 2\epsilon^{-1}),$$

$$r(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon), \lambda(\beta)) = (1 - \lambda(\beta))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 1 + \sqrt{2\mu_\alpha(\epsilon)},$$

$$q(\mu_\alpha(\epsilon), \lambda(\beta)) = -(1-\lambda(\beta))^{-1} W_0(-e^{-2\mu_\alpha(\epsilon)(1-\lambda(\beta))-\frac{6}{5}}).$$

There are $\binom{m}{\beta m}$ subsets $T \subseteq \{1, \ldots, m\}$ with $|T^c| = \beta m$. Use Stirling's approximation (7) of binomial coefficient we have

$$\binom{n}{k} \leq \frac{e}{2\pi} \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^k \left(\frac{n}{n-k}\right)^{n-k} \left(\frac{n}{k(n-k)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{e}{2\pi} \left(\frac{n}{k(n-k)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} [\beta^{-\beta n}(1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)n}].$$

Note that $\frac{n}{k(n-k)} \leq 2$. Thus

$$\binom{n}{k} \leq \frac{e}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\beta^{-\beta m}(1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)m} \leq \exp\left(n(1-\lambda)^{-1}\ln(\beta^{-\beta}(1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)})\right).$$

Hence it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(p(\alpha,\lambda(\beta))\sqrt{m} \leq s_{\min}(A_T) \leq s_{\max}(A_T) \leq r(\alpha,\lambda(\beta))\sqrt{m}, \forall T \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}, |T^c| = \beta n\right)\\
\geq& 1 - 3\binom{n}{k}e^{-\alpha m n}\\
\geq& 1 - 3\exp(m(-\alpha + (1-\lambda)^{-1}\ln[\beta^{-\beta}(1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)}]))\\
\geq& 1 - 3\exp(-\nu m),
\end{aligned}$$

provided that $\nu = \alpha - (1-\lambda)^{-1}\ln[\beta^{-\beta}(1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)}] > 0$. Thus by setting

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta) &= \nu + (1-\lambda)^{-1}\ln[\beta^{-\beta}(1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)}],\\
\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon) &= \alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta) + \ln(1+2\epsilon^{-1}),\\
r(\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon),\lambda(\beta)) &= (1-\lambda(\beta))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 1 + \sqrt{2\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon)},\\
q(\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon),\lambda(\beta)) &= -(1-\lambda(\beta))^{-1}W_0(-e^{-2\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon)(1-\lambda(\beta))-\frac{6}{5}}),\\
P(\nu,\lambda,\beta) &:= \sup_{\epsilon\in(0,1)}\sqrt{q(\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}(\epsilon),\lambda(\beta))} - \epsilon r(\mu_{\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)},\lambda(\beta)),\\
R(\nu,\lambda,\beta) &= (1-\lambda(\beta))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 1 + \sqrt{2\alpha(\nu,\lambda,\beta)},
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 3e^{\nu m}$ we have

$$\max_{T\subseteq\{1,\dots,n\},|T^c|=\beta n} Cond(A_T) \leq \frac{R(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}{P(\nu,\lambda,\beta)},$$

where $Cond(A_T)$ denotes the condition number of A_T. □

Remark 4.9. We used two different approaches to estimate the extreme singular values:

- For the smallest singular value, we used a brute force method. We didn't use concentration inequality type argument because the concentration inequality tells that for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ with $n \geq m$, we have

  $$\mathbb{P}(s_{\min}(A) \leq \sqrt{n} - \sqrt{m} - t) \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

  This a sharp estimate proved in [24]. We see that if we put $t = \sqrt{m} - \sqrt{n}$, then the probability is in fact zero, but the right hand side gives the bound $e^{-\frac{(\sqrt{n}-\sqrt{m})^2}{2}} > 0$. We would like to have an estimate of the type

  $$\mathbb{P}(s_{\min}(A) \leq s(t;n)) \leq s'(t), \quad \forall t > 0$$

  where s and s' are some functions of t such that $\lim_{t\to 0^+} s'(t) = 0$ whenlim$_{t\to 0^+} s(t;n) = 0$. In other words, we would like the probability tends to 0 as the upper bound of the smallest singular value tends to 0
- For the largest singular value, we take the concentration inequality for grant, this is due to the fact that this approach gives better results than the brute force method, also it is much simpler.

4.3. **Numerical Examples.** In this section we provide some numerical examples.

Example 4.10. Let $\nu = 0.1$, we will see how large the number

$$C(\nu,\lambda,\beta) := \frac{R(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}{P(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}$$

can be if we keep the ratio $\frac{\beta}{\lambda}$ is fixed.

- $\frac{\beta}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{10}$:



FIGURE 1. The graph of $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ for $\frac{\beta}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{10}$ and $\nu = 0.1$

TABLE 1. Some numerical values of $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ with $\nu = 0.1$ and $\frac{\beta}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{10}$

λ	$\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{4}{5}$
β	$\frac{1}{50}$	$\frac{1}{30}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{15}$	$\frac{2}{25}$
$R(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$	2.774	3.514	3.716	3.965	4.873
$P(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$	6.261×10^{-9}	4.639×10^{-5}	0.004236	0.04848	0.2028
$C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$	4.431×10^{8}	7.575×10^{4}	877.2	81.80	24.03

We see that in this case $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ decreases as λ in creases, and as λ approaches 1, $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ approaches around 4.43.

- $\frac{\beta}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{2}$:



FIGURE 2. The graph of $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ for $\frac{\beta}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\nu = 0.1$

TABLE 2. Some numerical values of $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ with $\nu = 0.1$ and $\frac{\beta}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{2}$

λ	$\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{4}{5}$
β	$\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{5}{12}$
$R(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$	3.067	3.364	3.790	4.419	5.364
$P(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$	6.261×10^{-9}	4.814×10^{-5}	0.004312	0.04848	0.2028
$C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$	4.899×10^{8}	6.987×10^{4}	878.9	91.15	26.45

We see that in this case $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ also decreases as λ in creases, and as λ approaches 1, $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ approaches around 4.76.

- $\frac{\beta}{\lambda} = \frac{9}{10}$:



FIGURE 3. The graph of $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ for $\frac{\beta}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\nu = 0.1$

TABLE 3. Some numerical values of $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ with $\nu = 0.1$ and $\frac{\beta}{\lambda} = \frac{9}{10}$

λ	$\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{4}{5}$
β	$\frac{9}{50}$	$\frac{3}{10}$	$\frac{9}{20}$	$\frac{3}{5}$	$\frac{18}{25}$
$R(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$	3.187	3.450	3.767	4.154	4.659
$P(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$	6.261×10^{-9}	4.814×10^{-5}	0.004312	0.04848	0.2028
$C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$	5.090×10^{8}	7.167×10^{4}	873.7	85.69	22.97

In this case $C(\nu, \lambda, \beta)$ approaches around 2.83 as λ approaches 1.

Next we provide some simulation results which gives the real condition number of a reduced Gaussian matrix. The way we simulate is the following:

(1) Generate an $m \times n$ matrix which has entries drawn from i.i.d standard normal entries.
(2) Arbitrarily remove βm rows and calculate the condition number of the reduced matrix.
(3) Repeat step 1 and 2 for 10000 times.
(4) Find the value that is only exceeded with $1 - e^{-0.1N}$ probability, call this number $C_{-0.1N}$.

Here we provide some simulation results for different values of λ and β:

TABLE 4. Some simulation results of the condition number with $\lambda = \frac{1}{5}$, $\beta = \frac{9}{10}\lambda$ and $\nu = 0.1$

size	1500×1200	1250×1000	750×600	500×400	250×200
$C_{-0.1N}$	241.807	252.109	211.431	184.239	123.703
$\frac{C_{-0.1N}}{C(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}$	5.457×10^{-7}	5.690×10^{-7}	4.772×10^{-7}	4.158×10^{-7}	2.792×10^{-7}

TABLE 5. Some simulation results of the condition number with $\lambda = \frac{1}{5}$, $\beta = \frac{1}{10}\lambda$ and $\nu = 0.1$

size	1500×1200	1250×1000	750×600	500×400	250×200
$C_{-0.1N}$	21.459	21.623	20.971	20.236	18.377
$\frac{C_{-0.1N}}{C(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}$	4.843×10^{-8}	4.880×10^{-8}	4.733×10^{-8}	4.567×10^{-8}	4.147×10^{-8}

TABLE 6. Some simulation results of the condition number with $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$, $\beta = \frac{1}{2}\lambda$ and $\nu = 0.1$

size	2400×1200	2000×1000	1500×750	1000×500	800×400
$C_{-0.1N}$	10.907	10.801	10.756	10.911	11.011
$\frac{C_{-0.1N}}{C(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}$	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.013

TABLE 7. Some simulation results of the condition number with $\lambda = \frac{4}{5}$, $\beta = \frac{9}{10}\lambda$ and $\nu = 0.1$

size	3000×600	2400×480	2100×420	1800×360	1200×240
$C_{-0.1N}$	12.414	12.262	12.178	12.024	12.024
$\frac{C_{-0.1N}}{C(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}$	0.540	0.534	0.530	0.523	0.523

TABLE 8. Some simulation results of the condition number with $\lambda = \frac{4}{5}$, $\beta = \frac{1}{10}\lambda$ and $\nu = 0.1$

size	3000×600	2400×480	2100×420	1800×360	1200×240
$C_{-0.1N}$	2.813	2.802	2.817	2.819	2.863
$\frac{C_{-0.1N}}{C(\nu,\lambda,\beta)}$	0.117	0.117	0.117	0.117	0.119

4.4. **The case $\lambda = \beta$.** From our analysis above, we see that the arguments do not take care of the case when the reduced matrix is a square matrix, i.e. $\beta = \lambda$. In the case where the matrix left is square after erasure, it turns out that the reduced matrix is still a frame with high probability. However the condition number in this case depends on the size of the matrix.
The following result provides an optimal estimate for the smallest singular value of a square Gaussian matrix.

Proposition 4.11. *([19, Theorem 3.1])Let A be an $m \times m$ matrix with i.i.d. real standard normal entries, then for any fixed $c > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(s_{\min}(A) \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{m}}\right) \leq c.$$

Theorem 4.12. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ $(n > m)$ be a random matrix with i.i.d. standard normal entries. Let $\lambda = 1 - \frac{m}{n} > 0$. Then for any $\alpha > \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}(1 - \ln\lambda) + 1$ and $c(m) \leq 2\left(\frac{e}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}m}$, A is a NERF of level $(\lambda, \frac{2+\sqrt{2\alpha}}{c(m)}m)$ with probability at least*
$1 - \left(\frac{e}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}m} c - \exp\left(m\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}(1 - \ln\lambda) - \alpha\right)\right)$.

Proof. Let $T \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ with $|T^c| = \lambda n$. Then A_T is an $m \times m$ matrix with i.i.d standard normal entries. As there are $\binom{n}{\lambda n}$ choices of such T, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(s_{\min}(A_T) \leq cm^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \forall T \text{ with } |T^c| = \lambda n\right) \leq \binom{n}{\lambda n} c \leq \left(\frac{en}{\lambda n}\right)^{\lambda n} c = \left(\frac{e}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}m} c.$$

On the other hand, for any $t > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\max}(A_T) \geq 2\sqrt{m} + t) \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}.$$

Set $t = \sqrt{2\alpha m}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\max}(A_T) \geq (2 + \sqrt{2\alpha})\sqrt{m}) \leq e^{-\alpha m}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(s_{\max}(A_T) \leq (2 + \sqrt{2\alpha})\sqrt{m}, \forall T \text{ with } |T^c| = \lambda n\right) &\leq \binom{n}{\lambda n} e^{-\alpha} \leq \left(\frac{en}{\lambda n}\right)^{\lambda n} e^{-\alpha m} \\ &= \exp\left(m\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}(1 - \ln\lambda) - \alpha\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

We now provide some numerical simulation results to visualize the behaviour of the condition number as the matrix size grows. Our simulation procedure is the following:

(1) Generate an $m \times n$ matrix which has entries drawn from i.i.d standard normal entries.
(2) Arbitrarily remove $m - n$ rows and calculate the condition number of the reduced matrix.
(3) Repeat step 1 and 2 for 10000 times.
(4) Find the value that is only exceeded with 10% probability, call this number $C_{=10\%}$.

TABLE 9. Some numerical values of the condition number with $\lambda = \beta = \frac{1}{2}$

size	4000×2000	3000×1500	2000×1000	1000×500
$C_{=10\%}$	5.499×10^{12}	1.311×10^{9}	2.0996×10^{7}	51073.45
size	800×400	600×300	500×250	400×200
$C_{=10\%}$	14735.07	9.851	9.692	9.442

5. Summary and Discussion

In this paper, we first studied the robustness properties of the ± 1 random matrices. We've proved that ± 1 random matrices satisfy the strong restricted isometry property of certain level and order, and the robust version of the Johnson-Lindenstrauss Lemma. Secondly studied the Gaussian finite frames We fixed the mistakes and improved the argument from

previous work, and convinced that Gaussian finite frames are numerically erasure robust. From our analysis, we can see that there are also some problems which are of interest for future works:

- We know that the ± 1 random matrices do not satisfy the SRIP with high probability if the erasure ratio is $\frac{1}{2}$ or higher. Then we would like to ask what is the maximum possible erasure ratio which still guarantees the SRIP for ± 1 matrices. Our result showed that if the erasure ratio is very small, then the SRIP holds. To study what would happen if the erasure ratio is above the upper bound we provided, it seems that significantly new ideas maybe required.
- For the study of Gaussian finite frames: From the numerical simulation results, we see that our estimate is loose when the redundancy rate λ is small, but gets much sharper as λ approached 1. We would like to find a way to determine the sharp estimates on the condition numbers for arbitrary λ.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Professor Bin Han, for his patient help and encouragements.

References

[1] Achlioptas, Dimitris. *Database-friendly random projections: Johnson-Lindenstrauss with binary coins.* Special issue on PODS 2001 (Santa Barbara, CA). J. Comput. System Sci. 66 (2003), no. 4, 671–687.

[2] Baraniuk, Richard; Davenport, Mark; DeVore, Ronald; Wakin, Michael. *A simple proof of the restricted isometry property for random matrices.* Constr. Approx. 28 (2008), no. 3, 253–263.

[3] Bennett, G.; Dor, L. E.; Goodman, V.; Johnson, W. B.; Newman, C. M. *On uncomlemented subspaces of L_p, $1 < p < 2$,* Israel J. Math. 26 (1977), no. 2, 178–187.

[4] Buldygin, V. V.; Kozacenko, Ju. V. *Sub-Gaussian random variables.* (Russian) Ukrain. Mat. Zh. 32 (1980), no. 6, 723–730.

[5] Candés, Emmanuel J.; Romberg, Justin K.; Tao, Terence. *Robust uncertainty principles: exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information.* IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 52 (2006), no. 2, 489–509.

[6] Candés, Emmanuel J.; Romberg, Justin K.; Tao, Terence. *Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 59 (2006), no. 8, 1207–1223.

[7] Candés, Emmanuel J.; Tao, Terence. *Decoding by linear programming.* IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 51 (2005), no. 12, 4203–4215.

[8] Davidson, Kenneth R.; Szarek, Stanislaw J. *Local operator theory, random matrices and Banach spaces.* Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol. I, 317–366, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2001.

[9] DeVore, Ronald; Petrova, Guergana; Wojtaszczyk, Przemyslaw. *Instance-optimality in probability with an ℓ^1-minimization decoder.* Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. 27 (2009), no. 3, 275–288.

[10] Donoho, David L. *Compressed sensing.* IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 52 (2006), no. 4, 1289–1306.

[11] Fickus, Matthew; Mixon, Dustin G. *Numerically erasure-robust frames.* Linear Algebra Appl. 437 (2012), no. 6, 1394–1407.

[12] Gordon, Y.; Litvak, A. E.; Schütt, C.; Werner, E. *On the minimum of several random variables.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 134 (2006), no. 12, 3665–3675.

[13] Guédon, Olivier; Litvak, Alexander E.; Pajor, Alain; Tomczak-Jaegermann, Nicole. *Restricted isometry property for random matrices with heavy-tailed columns.* C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 352 (2014), no. 5, 431–434.

[14] Haagerup, Uffe. *The best constants in the Khintchine's inequality*, Studia Math. 70 (1981), no. 3, 231-283.

[15] Han, Bin; Xu, Zhiqiang. *Robustness properties of dimensionality reduction with gaussian random matrices*, arXiv:1501.01695v1 [cs.IT] 8 Jan 2015.

[16] Houdré, Christian; Mason, David; Rosinsky, Jan; Wellner, Jon A.. *High Dimensional Probability VI: The Banff Volume*, Birkhäuser, 2013.

[17] Ledoux, Micheal. *The concentration of measure phenomenon.* American Mathematical Society, 2001.

[18] Lorentz, G.G., von Golitschek, M., Makovoz, Yu. *Constructive Approximation: Advanced Problems.* vol. 304. Springer, Berlin (1996)

[19] Rudelson, Mark; Vershynin, Roman. *Non-asymptotic theory of random matrices: extreme singular values.* Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians. Volume III, 15761602, Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi, 2010.

[20] Olver, F. W. J. *Uniform, exponentially improved, asymptotic expansions for the confluent hypergeometric function and other integral transforms.* SIAM J. Math. Anal. 22 (1991), no. 5, 1475–1489.

[21] Rauhut, Holger. *Compressive sensing and structured random matrices.* Theoretical foundations and numerical methods for sparse recovery, 1–92, Radon Ser. Comput. Appl. Math., 9, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2010.

[22] Rudelson, Mark; Vershynin, Roman. *On sparse reconstruction from Fourier and Gaussian measurements.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 61 (2008), no. 8, 1025–1045.

[23] Tao, Terence; Vu, Van. *On the singularity probability of random Bernoulli matrices.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 20 (2007), no. 3, 603–628.

[24] Vershynin, Roman. *Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices.* Compressed sensing, 210–268, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2012.

[25] Voroninski, Vladislav; Xu, Zhiqiang. *A strong restricted isometry property, with an application to phaseless compressed sensing.* Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. 40 (2016), no. 2, 386–395.

[26] Wang, Yang. *Random matrices and erasure robust frames*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. (2016),doi:10.1007/s00041-016-9486-6

Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada, T6G 2G1

E-mail address: rlu3@ualberta.ca